

Recent searches for solar axions and large extra dimensions

R. Horvat, M. Krčmar, and B. Lakić

Ruder Bošković Institute, P.O.Box 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We analyze the data from two recent experiments designed to search for solar axions within the context of multidimensional theories of the Kaluza-Klein type. In these experiments, axions were supposed to be emitted from the solar core, in $M1$ transitions between the first excited state and the ground state of ^{57}Fe and ^7Li . Because of the high multiplicity of axionic Kaluza-Klein states which couple with the strength of ordinary QCD axions, we obtain much more stringent experimental limits on the four-dimensional Peccei-Quinn breaking scale f_{PQ} , compared with the solar QCD axion limit. Specifically, for the ^{57}Fe experiment, $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1 \times 10^6$ GeV in theories with two extra dimensions and a higher-dimensional gravitational scale M_H of order 100 TeV, and $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1 \times 10^6$ GeV in theories with three extra dimensions and M_H of order 1 TeV (to be compared with the QCD axion limit, $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 8 \times 10^3$ GeV). For the ^7Li experiment, $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1.4 \times 10^5$ GeV and 3.4×10^5 GeV, respectively (to be compared with the QCD axion limit, $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1.9 \times 10^2$ GeV). It is an interesting feature of our results that, in most cases, the obtained limit on f_{PQ} cannot be coupled with the mass of the axion, which is essentially set by the (common) radius of the extra dimensions.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Kk, 14.80.Mz, 24.80.+y, 96.60.Vg

Introduction.—The recognition that there may be one or more extra space dimensions which have sizes of the order of a millimeter raises a good deal of interest [1]. The main motivation for introducing new physics is the possibility to associate the Fermi scale with the Planck scale of $(4 + n)$ -dimensional gravity, thereby providing a natural solution for the hierarchy problem of particle physics. Specifically, it has been suggested in such a novel theoretical framework that ordinary matter is confined to a 3-brane configuration, while gravity and other, hypothetical, particles which interact very weakly with matter (such as sterile neutrinos or axions) are only allowed to inhabit the extra compactified dimensions.

The fact that the current validity of Newton's law of gravitation (~ 0.1 mm) allows for the existence of extra dimensions as large as millimeters made these models attractive for phenomenology [2]. Moreover, because of the presence of a large number of new particles at the TeV scale, one can expect a rich phenomenology for collider physics. Finally, if future collider experiments fail to discover supersymmetry, which is the almost universally accepted framework for constructing extensions of the standard model and the main proposal that solves the hierarchy problem, the whole scenario might become an exceedingly interesting alternative.

In spite of all the attractive features mentioned above, it is clear that the simplest models with TeV fundamental scales and large extra dimensions will not work any more in all particle physics phenomena that invoke high-energy scales. Thus, for instance, mechanisms for neutrino mass generation (the seesaw mechanism), gauge coupling unification, proton decay, and the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) mechanism for explanation of the strong CP problem in the quantum chromodynamics (QCD) need to be revised in the new theory. In the latter case, in order to preserve the axion solution to the strong CP problem, three independent higher-dimensional features leading to an “invisible”

axion were discovered [3].

In this paper, in light of this novel framework, we review data from two recent experiments [4, 5] aimed to detect solar, near-monochromatic hadronic axions. The experimental efforts [4, 5] to detect solar axions were the first to employ a new scheme for detection of hadronic axions which couple only to nucleons, as proposed by Moriyama [6] and by Krčmar and collaborators [5]. Having been convinced of a mechanism for achieving an invisible axion [3], one is then allowed to assume an infinite tower of Kaluza-Klein (KK) excitations as the most important feature of placing the QCD axion in the extra dimensions. Our kinematical limits are high enough to ensure high multiplicity of the KK axion modes (for two or three extra dimensions), leading to a much larger flux than in ordinary theories and enabling us to place a much more stringent limit on the PQ-breaking scale f_{PQ} . In addition, our results on f_{PQ} practically demonstrate the most important feature leading to the “invisibility” of the axion: a complete decoupling of the mass of the axion from the PQ-breaking scale f_{PQ} .

QCD axions.—Peccei-Quinn solution to the strong CP problem in QCD [7] predicts the existence of a neutral, spin-zero pseudoscalar particle, called the (QCD) axion, associated with the spontaneously broken PQ symmetry. The mass of the axion (m_{PQ}) is related to the PQ symmetry breaking scale by $m_{\text{PQ}}/\text{eV} = 6 \times 10^6 \text{ GeV}/f_{\text{PQ}}$. Two classes of axion models are discussed commonly in the literature: KSVZ (Kim-Shifman-Vainshtein-Zakharov) models [8] and DFSZ (Dine-Fischler-Srednicki-Zhitnitskiĭ) or grand unified theory (GUT) models [9]. Since the KSVZ axions do not interact with electrons at tree level, they are referred to as hadronic axions. In addition, their coupling to photons, $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \propto m_{\text{PQ}} [E/N - 2(4+z+w)/3(1+z+w)]$, depends upon a model-dependent numerical parameter E/N , while for DFSZ axions $E/N = 8/3$. As such,

hadronic models with $E/N = 2$ [10] will have greatly suppressed photon couplings because of a cancellation of two unrelated numbers, one being a function of the number of new quarks and their charges, the other a function of quark mass ratios $z \equiv m_u/m_d \simeq 0.55$ and $w \equiv m_u/m_s \simeq 0.029$ [11].

Cosmological and astrophysical considerations appear to restrict the PQ-breaking scale to two possible ranges, the so-called “hadronic axion window” of hot dark matter interest [12], $3 \times 10^5 \text{ GeV} \lesssim f_{\text{PQ}} \lesssim 7 \times 10^5 \text{ GeV}$ [13, 14], and a window of cold dark matter interest, $10^9 \text{ GeV} \lesssim f_{\text{PQ}} \lesssim 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$ [15]. The first range exists only for hadronic QCD axions as long as the axion to photons coupling is sufficiently small ($E/N = 2$). DFSZ-type QCD axions are excluded from this region by the globular-cluster arguments based on the axion to photons and axion to electron couplings [13]. These arguments do not affect hadronic QCD axions which couple only to nucleons ($E/N = 2$) because their interactions with photons and electrons are strongly suppressed.

It should be noted that the hadronic axion window is indicated by the supernova (SN) 1987A cooling and axion burst arguments which suffer from statistical weakness, with only 19 neutrinos being observed, as well as from all uncertainties related to the axion emission from a hot and dense nuclear medium [13, 14]. It is therefore of crucial importance to experimentally measure or constrain the hadronic axion window.

In the following, the questions concerning the PQ-breaking scale related to the hadronic axions will be addressed.

Limits on f_{PQ} from ^{57}Fe and ^7Li experiments.—Two new sources of near-monochromatic axions which might be emitted from the solar core have been recently proposed: (i) thermally excited nuclei of ^{57}Fe which is one of the stable isotopes of iron, exceptionally abundant among the heavy elements in the Sun [6], and (ii) excited nuclei of ^7Li produced in the solar interior by ^7Be electron capture and thus accompanying the emission of ^7Be solar neutrinos of energy 384 keV [5]. Since the axion is a pseudoscalar particle, one can expect the emission of near-monochromatic axions during $M1$ transitions between the first excited level and the ground state in ^{57}Fe and ^7Li . The high temperatures in the center of the Sun ($\sim 1.3 \text{ keV}$) symmetrically broaden the axion line to a full width at half maximum of about 5 eV and 0.5 keV owing to the motion of axion emitters ^{57}Fe and ^7Li , respectively. As a result of Doppler broadening, these axions, approximately centered at the transition energy $E_0 = 14.4 \text{ keV}$ and $E_0 = 478 \text{ keV}$, would be resonantly absorbed by the same nucleus ^{57}Fe and ^7Li , respectively, in a laboratory on the Earth. The detection of subsequent emission of gamma rays either of 14.4 keV or 478 keV would be a sign of axion existence.

Following the calculations in Refs. [5, 6], one can find that the rate of excitation per particular nucleus which is expected for solar-produced axions incident on a labo-

ratory target of that metal is given by

$$P(m_{\text{PQ}}) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dE_a \frac{d\Phi(E_a)}{dE_a} \sigma_D(E_a), \quad (1)$$

where $d\Phi(E_a)/dE_a$ is the differential flux of particular solar axions and $\sigma_D(E_a)$ is the effective cross section for resonant absorption of these axions by a particular nucleus on the Earth. Both $d\Phi(E_a)/dE_a$ and $\sigma_D(E_a)$ increase as Γ_a/Γ_γ . Here

$$\frac{\Gamma_a}{\Gamma_\gamma} = \left(\frac{k_a}{k_\gamma}\right)^3 \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha} \frac{1}{1+\zeta^2} \left[\frac{g_0\beta + g_3}{(\mu_0 - \frac{1}{2})\beta + \mu_3 - \eta} \right]^2 \quad (2)$$

represents the branching ratio of the $M1$ axionic transition relative to the gamma transition [16] and contains the nuclear-structure-dependent terms β and η as well as the isoscalar and isovector nuclear magnetic moments μ_0 and μ_3 . The momenta of the photon and the axion are denoted by $k_\gamma \approx E_0$ and $k_a \approx \sqrt{E_0^2 - m_{\text{PQ}}^2}$, respectively, while $\alpha = 1/137$ is the fine structure constant, and ζ is the $E2/M1$ mixing ratio. The isoscalar and isovector axion-nucleon coupling constants, g_0 and g_3 , are related to f_{PQ} in the hadronic axion model [10, 17] by the expressions

$$g_0 = -\frac{m_N}{f_{\text{PQ}}} \frac{1}{6} \left[2S + (3F - D) \frac{1+z-2w}{1+z+w} \right] \quad (3)$$

and

$$g_3 = -\frac{m_N}{f_{\text{PQ}}} \frac{1}{2} (D + F) \frac{1-z}{1+z+w}, \quad (4)$$

where m_N is the nucleon mass, the constants F and D are the invariant matrix elements of the axial current, determined from hyperon semi-leptonic decays, and S is the flavor-singlet axial-vector matrix element extracted from polarized structure function data.

The experimental methods as described above are based on axion to nucleon coupling, both at the source as well as at the detector, and therefore favorable for investigating the hadronic axions. First experiments performed along this new line of solar axion searches set an upper limit on hadronic axion mass of 745 eV (^{57}Fe experiment) [4] and of 32 keV (^7Li experiment) [5] at the 95% confidence level. Translating these results into limits on the PQ-breaking scale, one obtains $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 8 \times 10^3 \text{ GeV}$ and $f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1.9 \times 10^2 \text{ GeV}$ for the experiment with ^{57}Fe and ^7Li , respectively.

Axions in large extra dimensions.—In Ref. [1], it was noted that with n compact extra dimensions, and factorizable geometry with volume V_n , the relation between the familiar Planck scale $M_{\text{Pl}} = 1.22 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV}$ and the higher-dimensional gravitational scale M_H is given by the formula

$$M_{\text{Pl}}^2 = M_H^{n+2} V_n, \quad (5)$$

where $V_n \equiv R^n$ was considered to be exponentially large, such that $M_H \sim M_W$. Similarly, one can place the QCD axion in the “bulk” of δ extra dimensions [1, 3, 18], by considering a relation of the type Eq. (5),

$$f_{\text{PQ}}^2 = \bar{f}_{\text{PQ}}^2 M_S^\delta V_\delta, \quad (6)$$

now connecting the four-dimensional PQ-breaking scale f_{PQ} with a higher-dimensional PQ-breaking scale $\bar{f}_{\text{PQ}}$, and M_S is the string scale, $M_S \sim M_H$. The most restrictive limits on the compactification scale M_H for $n=2$ and 3 extra dimensions come from astrophysics (for the most stringent constraints, see the recent work [19]).

Since the astrophysical limits on f_{PQ} [13, 14, 15] are many orders of magnitude larger than $M_H \sim M_W$, one should account for such a large mass scale by introducing the axion field in higher dimensions, with $\bar{f}_{\text{PQ}}$ that could even be much smaller than $\sim M_W$ [20]. On the other hand, as $f_{\text{PQ}} \ll M_{\text{Pl}}$, it is natural to assume that $\delta \leq n$ [3, 20]. The full generalization of the PQ mechanism to higher dimensions can be found in Ref. [3].

Another feature of the higher-dimensional axion field important to us is its Kaluza-Klein decomposition. These four-dimensional modes with an almost equidistant mass-splitting of order $1/R$ will be emitted from excited nuclei of ^{57}Fe and ^7Li up to their kinematic limits. Only the zero mode transforms under the PQ transformation as the true axion, and therefore is only required to have a derivative coupling to fermions, thereby playing a role of the ordinary QCD axion. It is, however, to the higher-dimensional structure of the axion field that each KK mode has identical derivative couplings to fermions, with strength set by f_{PQ} (the coupling strength of the full linear superposition of the KK states is set by $\bar{f}_{\text{PQ}}$).

Now, we calculate the rate from Eq. (1) as a function of the KK axion mass, with $k_a \approx \sqrt{E_0^2 - m_\delta^2}$. The masses of the KK modes are given by

$$m_\delta = \frac{1}{R} \sqrt{n_1^2 + n_2^2 + \dots + n_\delta^2} \equiv \frac{|\vec{\delta}|}{R}, \quad (7)$$

where we assume that all n extra dimensions are of the same size R . As a next step we need to calculate a sum due to contributions of the massive KK modes. Because of the smallness of the mass splitting for the size R large enough ($\sim 1/R$), it is justifiable to use integration instead of summation [21]. The rate of excitation per particular nucleus from Eq. (1) therefore reads

$$P = \frac{2\pi^{\delta/2}}{\Gamma(\delta/2)} R^\delta \int_0^{E_0} dm m^{\delta-1} P(m). \quad (8)$$

For $n = 2, 3, 4$ extra dimensions ($\delta \leq n$), our limits on f_{PQ} for both experiments are summarized in Tables I and II.

Discussion.—One notices from Tables I and II that our lower limits on f_{PQ} are always much more stringent than that obtained in conventional theories. Obviously,

TABLE I: Limits on f_{PQ} , m_{PQ} , and m_a derived from the experiment with ^{57}Fe [4] when the QCD axion is placed in the bulk of two and three extra spacetime dimensions.

$n = 2$		$M_H = 100 \text{ TeV}$		$M_H = 1000 \text{ TeV}$			
R		$1.22 \times 10^3 \text{ keV}^{-1}$		12.2 keV^{-1}			
$1/2 R^{-1}$		0.4 eV		41 eV			
δ		1	2	1	2		
f_{PQ}/GeV		9×10^4	1×10^6	3×10^4	1×10^5		
m_{PQ}/eV		67	6	211	60		
m_a/eV		0.4	0.4	41	41		
$n = 3$		$M_H = 1 \text{ TeV}$		$M_H = 10 \text{ TeV}$			
R		53 keV^{-1}		1.14 keV^{-1}			
$1/2 R^{-1}$		9.4 eV		439 eV			
δ		1	2	3	1	2	3
f_{PQ}/GeV		4×10^4	2×10^5	1×10^6	2×10^4	3×10^4	6×10^4
m_{PQ}/eV		146	29	6	375	197	103
m_a/eV		9.4	9.4	6	375	197	103

TABLE II: Limits on f_{PQ} , m_{PQ} , and m_a derived from the experiment with ^7Li [5] when the QCD axion is placed in the bulk of two, three and four extra spacetime dimensions.

$n = 2$		$M_H = 100 \text{ TeV}$		$M_H = 1000 \text{ TeV}$			
R		$1.22 \times 10^3 \text{ keV}^{-1}$		12.2 keV^{-1}			
$1/2 R^{-1}$		0.4 eV		41 eV			
δ		1	2	1	2		
f_{PQ}/GeV	$\gtrsim$	5×10^3	1×10^5	2×10^3	1×10^4		
m_{PQ}/eV	$\gtrsim$	1×10^3	43	4×10^3	429		
m_a/eV	$\lesssim$	0.4	0.4	41	41		
$n = 3$		$M_H = 1 \text{ TeV}$		$M_H = 10 \text{ TeV}$			
R		53 keV^{-1}		1.14 keV^{-1}			
$1/2 R^{-1}$		9.4 eV		439 eV			
δ		1	2	3	1	2	3
f_{PQ}/GeV	$\gtrsim$	2×10^3	3×10^4	3×10^5	9×10^2	4×10^3	2×10^4
m_{PQ}/eV	$\gtrsim$	3×10^3	211	18	7×10^3	1×10^3	316
m_a/eV	$\lesssim$	9.4	9.4	9.4	439	439	316
$n = 4$		$M_H = 1 \text{ TeV}$		$M_H = 10 \text{ TeV}$			
R		0.11 keV^{-1}		1.14 keV^{-1}			
$1/2 R^{-1}$		$4.5 \times 10^3 \text{ eV}$		439 eV			
δ		1	2	3	4		
f_{PQ}/GeV	$\gtrsim$	5×10^2	1×10^3	3×10^3	8×10^3		
m_{PQ}/eV	$\gtrsim$	1×10^4	5×10^3	2×10^3	714		
m_a/eV	$\lesssim$	4×10^3	4×10^3	2×10^3	714		

this is due to the fact that for $E_0 > R^{-1}$ the multiplicity of states which can be produced is large. Going to higher n the mass splitting of the spectrum becomes larger, thereby decreasing the multiplicity, and the bound on f_{PQ} is less stringent. Such a behavior is clearly displayed in Tables I and II.

Another feature visible in our Tables I and II represents a practical demonstration of the effect found in Ref. [3] that the mass of the axion can become independent of the energy scale associated with the breaking of the PQ symmetry. Such an effect can be used to decouple the mass of the axion from its couplings to ordinary matter, thereby providing a sought-for method of rendering the

axion invisible in higher-dimensional scenarios. The effect of KK modes on the axion mass matrix is such that the zero-mode axion mass is strictly bounded by the radius of the extra dimensions, $m_a \leq (1/2)R^{-1}$. Thus, in higher dimensions the mass of the axion is approximately given as [3]

$$m_a \approx \min \left(\frac{1}{2} R^{-1}, m_{\text{PQ}} \right). \quad (9)$$

We see that for most combinations of n, δ , and R , the upper limit on m_{PQ} is considerably higher than $(1/2)R^{-1}$, and therefore cannot be considered as a genuine limit on the mass of the axion.

Summary.—We have interpreted data from two recent experiments aimed to search for solar, near-monochromatic axions, assuming KK axions coming from

the Sun. Within the context of conventional hadronic models with $E/N = 2$, both experiments set a stringent upper limit on the axion mass. We have shown that data, when interpreted in the higher-dimensional framework, cannot be used, in most cases, to set any relevant limit on the axion mass. On the other hand, our lower limits on the four-dimensional PQ-breaking scale turned out to always be a few orders of magnitude more stringent than the ordinary QCD limit. Finally, we stress that the most restrictive bounds we have derived from the ^{57}Fe experiment ($f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1 \times 10^6$ GeV in theories with two extra dimensions and $M_H \sim 100$ TeV as well as in theories with three extra dimensions and $M_H \sim 1$ TeV) and from the ^7Li experiment ($f_{\text{PQ}} \gtrsim 1.4 \times 10^5$ GeV and 3.4×10^5 GeV, respectively) fall into the parameter space of hot dark matter interest.

-
- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 263 (1998); Phys. Rev. D **59**, 086004 (1999); I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, Nucl. Phys. B **516**, 70 (1998).
 - [2] C. D. Hoyle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1418 (2001).
 - [3] K. R. Dienes, E. Dudas, and T. Gherghetta, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 105023 (2000).
 - [4] M. Krčmar *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **442**, 38 (1998).
 - [5] M. Krčmar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 115016 (2001).
 - [6] S. Moriyama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3222 (1995).
 - [7] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977); Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1791 (1977).
 - [8] J. E. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 103 (1979); M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **166**, 493 (1980).
 - [9] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. **104B**, 199 (1981); A. R. Zhitnitskiĭ, Yad. Fiz. **31**, 497 (1980) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31**, 260 (1980)].
 - [10] D. B. Kaplan, Nucl. Phys. B **260**, 215 (1985).
 - [11] H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. B **378**, 313 (1996).
 - [12] T. Moroi and H. Murayama, Phys. Lett. B **440**, 69 (1998).
 - [13] G. G. Raffelt, *Stars as Laboratories for Fundamental Physics* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1996).
 - [14] J. Engel, D. Seckel, and A. C. Hayes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 960 (1990).
 - [15] See, e.g., G. G. Raffelt, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **49**, 163 (1999).
 - [16] F. T. Avignone III *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 618 (1988); W. C. Haxton and K. Y. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2557 (1991).
 - [17] M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. B **260**, 689 (1985).
 - [18] S. Chang, S. Tazawa, and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 084005 (2000).
 - [19] S. Hannestad and G. G. Raffelt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 071301 (2002).
 - [20] L. Di Lella, A. Pilaftsis, G. Raffelt, and K. Zioutas, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 125011 (2000).
 - [21] G. F. Giudice, R. Rattazzi, and J. D. Wells, Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 3 (1999); T. Han, J. D. Lykken, and R. J. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 105006 (1999).